

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 – 15 are pending in the application and are presented for a first substantive examination on the merits.

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1 – 15 were subjected to an election of species requirement.

By this Response to Election of Species Requirement, a provisional election of a single disclosed species is made.

**Election of Species Requirement Summary**

The Examiner has required election of one of three species – 1, 2, or 3, and identification of the claims reading thereon. The Examiner asserts that species 1, 2, and 3 are patentably distinct species as depicted in figures 3, 8, and 10, respectively.

**Response**

Applicant provisionally elects to continue prosecution of Species 1, figure 3. Applicant asserts that claims 1 – 4 read on figure 3. However, the Applicant's assertion in no way is an indication of an intention to limit the aforementioned claims to the embodiment depicted in figure 3. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is generic to all species, and thus, if found allowable, claims drawn to the species embodied in Figures 8 and 10, which incorporate all of the limitations found in the claim 1 would also be available for prosecution at this time.

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully request the Examiner to examine the elected claims pending in this application.

**CONCLUSION**

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to conduct a first

MS Amendment  
Attorney Docket No. 25618

substantive examination of the application. If the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding this matter, he is welcomed to contact the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number and address.

Respectfully submitted,  
**NATH & ASSOCIATES PLLC**

Date: August 4, 2004

By:



Gary M. Nath  
Registration No. 26,011  
Marvin C. Berkowitz  
Registration No. 47,421  
Derek Richmond  
Registration No. 45,771

Customer No. 20529